



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/113,712	07/10/1998	EDWARD F. HELINSKI	EN997043	8352

23416 7590 02/26/2003

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP
1220 N MARKET STREET
P O BOX 2207
WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

This is the new sheet the
address is the same. Please
check.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/113,712	07/10/1998	EDWARD F. HELINSKI	EN997043	8352

23416 7590 02/26/2003

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP
1220 N MARKET STREET
P O BOX 2207
WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 25

Application Number: 09/113,712
Filing Date: July 10, 1998
Appellant(s): Helinski

Harold Pezzner
For Appellant

MAILED 50
APR 04 2002
GROUP 3700

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's substitute brief on appeal filed January 17, 2002 and supplemental brief on appeal filed July 30, 2002.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the substitute brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the substitute brief.

Art Unit: 3724

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the substitute brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the substitute brief is correct. The after-final amendment filed June 28, 2001 has been entered.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the substitute brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the substitute brief is correct. The appellant's statement of the issues in the supplemental brief is no longer correct. Upon further consideration, particularly regarding appellant's clarifying remarks under the "Argument" section of the supplemental appeal brief, the rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph has been withdrawn.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's substitute brief includes a statement that claims 1-11, 21 and 22 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) *Claims Appealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the substitute brief is correct.

Art Unit: 3724

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

4,425,829	Kranik et al.	1-1984
5,214,991	Shimizu et al.	6-1993

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Rejection under 35 USC 102/103

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kranik et al., pn 4,425,829, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kranik et al., pn 4,425,829, in view of Shimizu et al., pn 5,214,991.

Claim 1

Kranik et al. discloses a system with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including: a first die (e.g., the die which includes surface 28) including a first aperture; a second die (e.g., 48) including a second aperture; a first housing (e.g., 14) including a first die passage receiving at least a portion of the first die (as shown in Fig. 1, the first die passage receives a portion of the first die and can receive the entire first die); and a second housing

Art Unit: 3724

(e.g., 42) including a second die passage receiving at least a portion of at least one of the first die and the second die (as shown in Fig. 1, the second die passage receives the entire second die). Further, the second die passage is configured to permit at least one of the first die and the second die to rotate therein; that is, “configured to permit at least one of the first die and the second die to rotate therein” is a limitation which is directed to the second die passage and is interpreted as defining the second die passage as being round thus permitting rotation therein. Kranik et al. meets this limitation in that the second die passage thereof (which receives component 48) is round.

In the alternative, if it is argued that there is no disclosure that the second die passage is round, the Examiner takes Official notice that round dies fitted into round die passages are old and well known in the art as evidenced by Shimizu et al. and provide well known benefits including ease of manufacture and assembly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the second die passage as well as the second die of Kranik et al. round for the well known benefits including those described above.

Claim 2

Kranik et al. substantially meets the claim in that Kranik et al. and is shown as being of such a width/diameter that either the first or second die can be received therein, and is long enough so that all of the second die and at least a portion of the first die can be received therein. But, Kranik et al. does not show or describe the second die passage receiving at least

Art Unit: 3724

a portion of the first die. However, the first and second die passages are the same size and the first and second dies are the same size. Thus, the first die (e.g., in the extended position shown in Figure 1) can clearly be received in the second die passage if the second die is moved downwardly within the second die passage. That is, Kranik et al. discloses all of the claimed structure and thus anticipates the invention set forth in claim 2. Kranik et al. only lacks the manipulation of the disclosed structure such that the second die passage receives a portion of the first die. However, such a manipulation of the disclosed components (i.e., moving one or more components to positions other than those explicitly shown in the drawings) is considered an intended use of the system disclosed by Kranik et al.

In the alternative, if it is argued that Kranik et al. does not explicitly teach that the dies are the same size and that the die passages are the same size, the Examiner takes Official notice that such a configuration is old and well known in the art and provides well known benefits including interchangeability of parts (i.e., any die can be pulled out of storage and used in either the first or second die passage). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the die passages configured to receive either the first die or the second die by making the dies the same size and the die passages the same size for the well known benefits including that described above.

Art Unit: 3724

Claim 3

Kranik et al. discloses the first die passage and the second die passage that are configured to permit at least the first die to rotate therein. That is, "configured to permit at least the first die to rotate therein" is a limitation directed to each of the first and second die passages and is interpreted as defining the first and second die passages as being round thus permitting rotation therein. Kranik et al. meets this limitation in that the first and second die passages thereof are round. Further, the first and second dies are shown as being the same size, and the first and second die passages are shown as being the same size, thus the second die passage is configured to permit rotation of the first die therein.

In the alternative, if it is argued that there is no disclosure that the first and second die passages are round, the Examiner takes Official notice that round dies fitted into round die passages are old and well known in the art as evidenced by Shimizu et al. and provide well known benefits including ease of manufacture and assembly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the first and second die passages along with the corresponding dies of Kranik et al. round for the well known benefits including those described above. Further in the alternative, if it is argued that Kranik et al. does not explicitly teach that the dies are the same size and that the die passages are the same size, the Examiner takes Official notice that such a configuration is old and well known in the art and provides well known benefits including interchangeability of parts (i.e., any die can be pulled out of storage and used in either the first or second die passage). Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 3724

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the dies the same size and the die passages the same size for the well known benefits including that described above.

Claim 6

Kranik et al. discloses a punch and die assembly with every structural limitation of the claimed invention including: a first die (e.g., the die which includes surface 28) including a first aperture; a second die (e.g., 48) including a second aperture; a first housing (e.g., 14) including a first die passage receiving at least a portion of the first die (as shown in Fig. 1, the first die passage receives a portion of the first die and can receive the entire first die); and a second housing (e.g., 42) including a second die passage being configured to receive at least a portion of the second die and at least a portion of the first die (as shown in Fig. 1, the second die passage receives the entire second die, and further the second die passage is shown as being the same size as the first die passage and thus is configured to receive the first die). Further, the second die passage is configured to permit at least one of the first die and the second die to rotate therein; that is, "configured to permit at least one of the first die and the second die to rotate therein" is a limitation directed to the second die passage and is interpreted as defining the second die passage as being round thus permitting rotation therein. Kranik et al. meets this limitation in that the second die passage thereof (which receives component 48) is round.

In the alternative, if it is argued that there is no disclosure that the second die passage is round, the Examiner takes Official notice that round dies fitted into round die passages are old

Art Unit: 3724

and well known in the art as evidenced by Shimizu et al. and provide well known benefits including ease of manufacture and assembly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the second die passage as well as the second die of Kranik et al. round for the well known benefits including those described above.

Claim 7

Kranik et al. meets the claim in that the second die passage receives all of the second die and is "configured to receive at least a portion of the first die" in that the second die passage is shown as being of such a width/diameter that either the first or second die can be received therein, and further is long enough so that all of the second die and at least a portion of the first die can be received therein. In the alternative, if it is argued that Kranik et al. does not explicitly teach that the dies are the same size and that the die passages are the same size, the Examiner takes Official notice that such a configuration is old and well known in the art and provides well known benefits including interchangeability of parts (i.e., any die can be pulled out of storage and used in either the first or second die passage). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the die passages configured to receive either the first die or the second die by making the dies the same size and the die passages the same size for the well known benefits including that described above.

Art Unit: 3724

Claim 8

The first die passage and the second die passage of Kranik et al. are round and thus are configured to permit at least the first die to rotate therein; that is, “configured to permit at least the first die to rotate therein” is a limitation directed to the first and second die passages. Again, the first die is the same size as the second die and thus the second die passage is configured to receive the first die (as well as permit rotation thereof). And again, in the alternative, if it is argued that Kranik et al. does not explicitly teach that the dies are the same size and that the die passages are the same size, the Examiner takes Official notice that such a configuration is old and well known in the art and provides well known benefits including interchangeability of parts (i.e., any die can be pulled out of storage and used in either the first or second die passage). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the die passages configured to receive either the first die or the second die by making the dies the same size and the die passages the same size for the well known benefits including that described above.

Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 4, 5, 9-11, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kranik et al., pn 4,425,829, or in the alternative, over Kranik et al., pn 4,425,829, in view of Shimizu et al., pn 5,214,991.

Art Unit: 3724

Regarding claims 4, 5, 9 and 10, Kranik et al. lacks alignment marks on the respective dies and lacks a specific disclosure of the alignment accuracy of the die apertures. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is old and well known in the art, particularly the manufacturing art, to custom manufacture cooperating components and to provide alignment marks on the components to facilitate the desired alignment of the components. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide alignment marks on the dies of Kranik et al., and to provide an accurate alignment of the die apertures for the well known benefits including that described above.

Regarding claim 11, Kranik et al. discloses a compression spring, but lacks the particular relationship between the spring, the punch and the housings. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is old and well known in the art to provide compression springs in any one of various known configurations to provide a biasing force to a punch. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the particular relationship between the spring, the punch and the housings as an alternative configuration for biasing the punch based on known considerations such as manufacturing considerations.

Regarding claims 21 and 22 as understood, the Examiner takes Official notice that it is old and well known in the art to provide punch and dies each in respective housings which are movable relative to each other for various known reasons including to repair and/or replace one of the punch or dies without removing the other. Therefore, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 3724

to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the upper and lower housings movable relative to one another for the well known benefits including that described above.

(11) *Response to Argument*

Basis for Rejections under 35 USC 102/103

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 102/103 because the prior art, specifically Kranik et al. discloses, or in the alternative suggests, all of the structure of the claimed invention. The only difference between appellant's claims and the invention of Kranik appears to be the selected positioning or manipulation of the claimed components as compared to the positions explicitly illustrated or described in Kranik. It is respectfully emphasized that the claims are not drawn to a method of aligning dies, but rather are drawn to a punch and die system/assembly. There appears to be no substantial difference between the present invention and the device of Kranik et al. while in operation. The only difference appears to be that the claimed invention discusses the preparation of a punch and die assembly for operation thereof, and such preparation is not explicitly taught by Kranik et al. However, the Examiner's position is that the device of Kranik et al. teaches and/or suggest all of the claimed punch and die assembly structure and is capable of being prepared for operation in the same manner as that described in the claims.

Art Unit: 3724

Claims 1, 3, 6-8:

Regarding claims 1,3 and 6-8, appellant relies on the language “configured to permit” the first die and/or the second die to rotate therein. However, the Examiner respectfully emphasizes that this language is directed to and describes the die passages. For example, claims 1 and 6 include the recitations “the second die (receiving) passage being configured to permit at least one of the first die and the second die to rotate therein.” This language is clearly directed to the second die passage (or in claim 6, the second die receiving passage). In looking to appellant’s invention as disclosed, the structure or configuration of the second die passage which permits rotation is that the second die passage is round. Kranik clearly discloses, or in the alternative suggests, a round die passage and thus teaches the same second die passage configuration. It is noted that there is nothing in the claims that define the specifics of the connection between the die and the die passages.

As a further example, claim 7 includes the recitation “the second die passage receives all of the second die and being configured to receive at least a portion of the first die.” Again, this language is clearly directed to the second die passage. In looking to appellant’s invention as disclosed, the structure or configuration of the second die passage which permits the second die passage to receive all of the second die and at least a portion of the first die is that the second die passage is the same diameter as the first die passage (so that it can receive the first die) and has a length to accommodate all of the second die and at least a portion of the first die. Kranik clearly discloses a second die passage that is the same width/diameter as the first

Art Unit: 3724

die passage and thus can clearly receive the first die. Further, the second die passage of Kranik clearly has a length to accommodate all of the second die and at least a portion of the first die. Thus, Kranik discloses, or in the alternative suggests, the same second die passage configuration.

As a further example, claims 3 and 8 include the recitation “the first die passage and the second die passage are configured to permit at least the first die to rotate therein.” This language is clearly directed to the die passages, specifically the first and second die passages. In looking to appellant’s invention as disclosed, the structure of the first die passage and the second die passage which permits the first die to rotate therein is that the first die passage is round; and the second die passage is round, is the same diameter as the first die passage, and has a length to accommodate at least a portion of the first die for rotation therein. Kranik clearly discloses, or in the alternative suggests, a round die passage. Further, Kranik clearly discloses a second die passage that is the same width/diameter as the first die passage and thus can clearly receive the first die. Additionally, the second die passage of Kranik clearly has a length to accommodate all of the second die and at least a portion of the first die. Thus, Kranik discloses, or in the alternative suggests, the same first and second die passage configurations.

Art Unit: 3724

Claim 2:

Regarding claim 2, it is respectfully emphasized that the present claim is directed to a “system,” not a method, and it is the Examiner’s position that Kranik et al. discloses all of the structure additionally set forth by claim 2. The only difference is that the components of Kranik are not disclosed or described as being in the positions set forth in the claims; specifically, Kranik does not show or describe at least a portion of the first die received in the second die passage. However, it is again respectfully emphasized that no structure needs to be added or removed, nor do the components of Kranik need to be structurally altered to meet the additional limitation of claim 2. Therefore, an “obviousness” rejection under 35 USC 103 directed to the subject matter of claim 2 has been considered by the Examiner to be inappropriate. All that is necessary is to reposition the components disclosed in Kranik. In other words, one skilled in the art using Kranik’s invention is entitled to manipulate or otherwise reposition/move the components therein in any way to prepare the device for operation. It is further emphasized that with the components located in the positions recited in claim 2, the device is inoperable as a punch and die apparatus/device. Kranik shows and describes a device that is ready for operation, thus Kranik would not show or describe the components oriented in an inoperable manner. The Examiner respectfully maintains that a mere manipulation of components, particularly in describing an inoperable configuration of a device, is clearly a matter of intended use of the disclosed invention of Kranik, and thus the limitation of claim 2 is considered to be a functional recitation of intended use. That is, one

Art Unit: 3724

could take Kranik's device and move at least a portion of the first die into the second die passage without structurally modifying the device of Kranik.

Basis for Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 4, 5, 9-11, 21 and 22 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 because the prior art, specifically Kranik et al. discloses, or in the alternative suggests, all of the structure of the claimed invention.

The Examiner has relied on Official notice to reject these claims and has taken the Official notice statement as admitted prior art because applicant failed to traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official notice. As stated in MPEP 2144.03,

Applicant must seasonably challenge well known statements and statements based on personal knowledge when they are made by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. In re Selmi, 156 F.2d 96, 70 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1946); In re Fischer, 125 F.2d 725, 52 USPQ 473 (CCPA 1942). See also In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 169 USPQ 231 (CCPA 1971) (a challenge to the taking of judicial notice must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying the judicial notice).

It is further stated in MPEP 2144.03 that

If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well known statement during examination, then the object of the well known statement is taken to be admitted prior art. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943). A seasonable challenge constitutes a demand for evidence made as soon as practicable during prosecution. Thus, applicant is charged with rebutting the well known statement in the next reply after the Office action in which the well known statement was made. This is necessary because the examiner must be given the opportunity to provide evidence in the next Office action or explain why no evidence is required. If the examiner adds a reference to the rejection in

Art Unit: 3724

the next action after applicant's rebuttal, the newly cited reference, if it is added merely as evidence of the prior well known statement, does not result in a new issue and thus the action can potentially be made final. If no amendments are made to the claims, the examiner must not rely on any other teachings in the reference if the rejection is made final.

It is respectfully submitted that the pending rejection was first presented to applicant on November 22, 1999 (paper no. 7) and the taking of Official notice was not "seasonably challenged" in that it was not traversed in the amendment filed immediately thereafter (paper no. 8) and has never been traversed or otherwise challenged. Regarding claims 21 and 22, they were added by applicant in an amendment filed November 15, 2000 (paper no. 14), and the taking of Official notice regarding these claims was not "seasonably challenged" in that it was not traversed in the amendment filed immediately thereafter and has never been traversed or otherwise challenged. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objects of the well known statements have been taken to be admitted prior art.

Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claims 1 and 3

Under item 2 on pages 7-8 of the substitute brief, appellant restates the Examiner's basis for rejection of claim 1 and then in a subsequent paragraph, restates the Examiner's response to appellant's arguments. However, under item 3 on pages 8-10 of the substitute brief, appellant appears to respond only to the Examiner's response to appellant's arguments.

Regarding item 3 on pages 8-10 of the substitute brief, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant's analysis. On page 9, lines 4-8, appellant argues that

Art Unit: 3724

“[E]ven assuming, however, that that the Kranik dies and die passages are round, there is still no teaching of structuring the relationship between those elements so as to permit rotation of at least one of the dies in the second die passage.”

It is respectfully submitted that appellant's argument is not understood, particularly since the specific relationship between dies and die passages being argued by appellant (i.e., that the die is received in and rotatable in the die passage) is not claimed. Rather, the claim clearly sets forth the second die passage as “being configured to permit at least one of the first and second die to rotate therein” which is clearly directed to defining the structure of the die passage, not the specific connection between one of the dies and the die passage. Appellant continues by arguing that

“It is not enough that the dies and die passages are round, there must be more; namely the fit between the die passage and at least one of the first die or the second die must be such so as to permit rotation.”

Again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with appellant's analysis. The claim clearly defines the structure of the second die passage, not the specific connection between one of the dies and the die passage. Appellant continues by stating that

“The Examiner does not really challenge the argument that in the prior art the dies are tightly pressure fitted in their receiving passages and thus could not be rotated. Instead, the Examiner in essence equates what is illustrated in Figure 2 of the present application as being the same as what is practiced in the prior art. This conclusion, however, overlooks the basis feature of the invention; namely, that there is sufficient clearance to permit rotation.”

Art Unit: 3724

Again, it is respectfully submitted that appellant's argument is not understood. First, the Examiner respectfully submits that the specific connection between the die and the die passage is not claimed. Second, if it is believed that such a connection is somehow inferred from the claims, appellant's argument is not clear since it seems that a tight pressure fit in either the present invention or Kranik is necessary else the device would not operate. That is, if there is not a tight fit in either device, the dies will move within the die recesses and result in improper operation of the device. Additionally, it is not clear on what basis appellant concludes that the prior art dies could not be rotated, particularly if the dies and die passages are round as taught by the prior art. For example, it is an old and well known practice in tool making that to fit one component inside another to form a pressure fit, the temperature of one or both of the components is modified to cause expansion or contraction such that at room temperature, the components will attempt to return to their original size and an adequate pressure fit will be provided. For example, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that by cooling the die and/or heating the material around the die (receiving) passage of Kranik, insertion of the die in the die passage along with rotation of the die in the die passage, if desired, would be facilitated. It is emphasized that how the die is permitted to rotate in the die passage is not important, only that the second die passage is configured to permit at least one of the first and second dies to rotate therein.

Art Unit: 3724

Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claims 2 and 6-8

Under item 3 on page 11 of the substitute brief, appellant argues that the die arrangement shown in Kranik is not the same as that described in the claims. The Examiner again respectfully disagrees with appellant's analysis. Surely it is recognized that the lower die of Kranik can be moved downwardly to provide room for the upper die to be inserted in the lower die passage. Again, it is respectfully emphasized that a method is not be claimed, and such an arrangement of components as claimed would merely be a matter of manipulating the existing components of Kranik to desired locations. Again, neither the present invention nor Kranik would be or would be intended to be operable with the upper die inserted into the lower die passage. Further, it is noted that only claim 2 positively describes the second die passage as receiving the first die. Claims 6-8 only require that the second die passage be configured to receive at least a portion of the first die. However, in both cases, the Examiner maintains the position that Kranik clearly teaches and/or suggests the claimed invention.

Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claims 4 and 9

Under item 3 beginning on page 12 of the substitute brief, appellant does not argue that the addition of alignment marks is not well known, rather appellant argues that there would be no reason to provide alignment marks based on appellant's contention that the dies of Kranik would not be rotated. First, it is noted that the Examiner's taking of Official notice went unchallenged (see the section "Basis for Rejections under 35 USC 103" above). Second, the

Art Unit: 3724

Examiner again respectfully disagrees with appellant's arguments. The Examiner's position is that Kranik meets the claimed limitations, particularly that the die passages are configured to permit rotation of the dies. Additionally, the Examiner maintains that it is old and well known, particularly in the tool making art, to provide alignment marks to precisely align cooperating components (see the last paragraph under the section "Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claims 1 and 3" above).

Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claims 5 and 10

Under item 3 on page 14 of the substitute brief, appellant argues that

"The Examiner's rejection overlooks that a main benefit of the claimed invention is in achieving a high degree of accuracy. This is in part the result of the structure of the parent claims regarding the ability to rotate at least one of the dies."

First, it is noted that the Examiner's taking of Official notice went unchallenged (see the section "Basis for Rejections under 35 USC 103" above). Second, the Examiner again respectfully disagrees with appellant's arguments. The Examiner's position is that Kranik meets the claimed limitations, particularly that the die passages are configured to permit rotation of the dies. Additionally, the Examiner maintains that it is old and well known, particularly in the tool making art, to precisely align cooperating components (see the last paragraph under the section "Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claims 1 and 3" above).

Art Unit: 3724

Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claim 11

Under item 3 on page 15 of the substitute brief, appellant argues that "the examiner cites no secondary art which discloses a compression spring engaging a die punch and a die housing to bias the punch to a retracted position." First, it is emphasized that the Examiner's taking of Official notice went unchallenged (see the section "Basis for Rejections under 35 USC 103" above). Therefore, the object of the prior art rejection has been taken to be admitted prior art. Second, the Examiner maintains the position that the claimed compression spring structure is old and well known in the art for various known benefits including to provide a biasing force to a punch to, for example, return the punch to a ready position.

Response to appellant's arguments regarding the rejection to claims 21 and 22

Under item 3 on pages 16-17 of the substitute brief, appellant argues that

"The Examiner again attempts to compensate for the lack of structure in the cited references by making a general reference to what is old and well known in the art without referring to any specific prior art as exemplifying such features and without showing why there would be motivation to modify the Kranik arrangement to incorporate such features."

Again, it is emphasized that the Examiner's taking of Official notice went unchallenged (see the section "Basis for Rejections under 35 USC 103" above). Therefore, the object of the prior art rejection has been taken to be admitted prior art. Second, the Examiner maintains the position that the claimed structure is old and well known in the art for various known benefits

Art Unit: 3724

including to provide punch and dies each in respective housings which are movable relative to each other for various known reasons including to repair and/or replace one of the punch or dies without removing the other.

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Clark F. Dexter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3724

cfid

February 24, 2003

Conferee: as Allan Shoap (SPE, GAU 3724)

Conferee: aw Andrea Wellington (SPE, GAU 3722)

Conferee: B Boyer Ashley (Primary Examiner, Class 83)

Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
1220 Market Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801